

Scott A. Schmok
Patent Agent

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 18 2004

105 Saddletree Lane
Dripping Springs, TX 78620

Phone: 512-264-0314
Fax: 512-264-3462
scott@hillcountrytx.net

Fax

To: Mohammaid Ali	From: Scott Schmok
Fax: 703-746-5652	Pages: 3
Phone: 703-605-4356	Date: 6/18/2004
Re: Telephonic Interview Agenda	CC:

☐ **Urgent** ☐ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ☐ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

● **Comments:**

Examiner Ali, attached are proposed agendas for our telephonic interview that is scheduled on June 21st at 11:00AM EST to discuss applications 10/015,291 and 10/015, 234.

Regards,

Scott Schmok

**Agenda for Telephonic Interview
June 21, 2004, 11:00 AM ET
Application 10/015,291**

I. High-Level Discussion of Applicants' Invention

- Uses permitted user id list that corresponds to a particular database in order to verify user id access permission to the database.

II. High-Level Discussion of Kumar Patent

- Includes context of data and importance of data in the data itself.
- Monitors the data to detect data that is deemed important.
- Provides reports based upon trigger conditions (e.g. late shipments).

II. Claim 1 Rejection Discussion

- a) Applicants claim retrieving a permitted user id list corresponding to a selected database. In contrast, the Office Action reference refers to data, which includes the data context and data importance (col. 10:16-18). Kumar does not teach or suggest retrieving or accessing a permitted user id list.
- b) Applicants claim determining whether a user id is included in the permitted user id list. In contrast, the Office Action reference refers to a security group object for accessing security rules associated with a security group. Kumar does not teach or suggest matching a user id with a permitted user id list.
- c) Applicants claim reporting the user id if the user id is not included in the permitted user id list. In contrast, the Office Action reference reports trigger conditions, such as a "late delivery." Kumar does not teach or suggest reporting a user id that attempts to access data in which the user id is not authorized.

III. Claim 2 Rejection Discussion

- a) Applicants provide a violation resolution, such as removing a user id from a directory access list (page 12, lines 13-15). In contrast, the Office Action's reference is the data itself, the data context and data importance (col. 10, lines 1-10). The Office Action refers to the same reference in Claim 1's rejection, but refers to the reference as a permitted user id list. Kumar does not teach or suggest providing a resolution to a violation. In addition, the Office Action's second reference (col. 19, lines 55-59) discusses the reporting of one or more trigger conditions, but does not discuss providing a "resolution", nor does Kumar teach or suggest that a trigger condition is a "violation."

IV. Claim 6 Rejection Discussion

- b) Applicants claim the permitted user id list is selected from the group consisting of a database instance owner, a sysadm group, and a sysmaint group. In contrast, the Office Action's reference (col. 19, lines 55-59) discusses the reporting of one or more trigger conditions, but does not discuss a permitted id list type as claimed by Applicants.

**Agenda for Telephonic Interview
June 21, 2004, 11:00 AM ET
Application 10/015,234**

I. High-Level Discussion of Applicants' Invention

- Translates messages from one format to another format in a multiple document exchange environment that includes a plurality of participants. The participants do not need a pre-arranged format to communicate with other participants. A message collaboration trail is also provided.

II. High-Level Discussion of Stewart Patent

- Provides a collaboration space such that multiple trading partners communicate with each other. Each conversation has a unique context that enables users to manage multiple, concurrent conversations that take place in the same "c-space", such as request for proposals.
- Provides asynchronous XML messaging capabilities to allow loosely coupled communication between trading partners (page 3, para. 0030).
- Collaborating entities must agree on the semantics of business protocol (page 9, para. 0133).

II. Claim 1 Rejection Discussion

- Applicants claim identifying a first format corresponding to a request and a second format corresponding to a target recipient. In contrast the Office Action's first reference discusses XML as a universal format (page 9, para. 0133) and the Office Action's second reference discusses "the enterprise applications and the workflow server use an XML format." Both references refer to XML as the format, and thus, do not discuss identifying a first format and a second format. Notarius does not discuss a request format, but rather discusses information fields.
- Applicants claim locating a process to format the request from the first format to the second format. In contrast, the Office Action's reference discusses using XML for communication, which provides a "true measure of collaborative e-commerce."
- Applicants claim formatting the request using a process. Again, the Office Action's reference discusses XML providing an open and flexible message format.

III. Claim 4 Rejection Discussion

- Applicants claim determining whether a transaction process implementation is available. In contrast, the Office Action's reference discusses matching a certificate of the sender and acting as a trusted intermediary in order to validate the sender.